RECEIVED
OREGON OPERATIONS OFFICE

AUG 24 2016

2833

EPA-REGION 10

U.S. EPA ATTN: Harbor Comments 805 SW Broadway, Suite 500 Portland, OR 97205

August 16, 2016

The EPA's plan sounds too expensive for the potentially harmful results we could get from cleaning the Willamette River. It's never a good idea to spend money, especially when it's estimated to cost approximately \$1 billion, on a plan that might do more harm than good. The project would restrict activities on the river, which would have a negative effect on the local economy. If jobs are lost in the Portland area, it would raise unemployment and result in higher taxes for the people of Portland. I am retired and collect both social security and a pension. I already pay taxes on my pension, and I wouldn't want to pay more on my limited income.

Less invasive cleanup methods sound like the better option, as has been done in the past in other areas. It seems like these methods would also work in this situation, especially considering the river has begun to restore itself naturally. Recent reports show there has been a 40 percent reduction in contamination levels. The EPA is putting too high a priority on trying to make the river completely clean at an unreasonable cost, instead of allowing the natural process to continue. It's highly unlikely that they can keep their project below their estimated budget and time frame, and it will be the taxpayers who pay the price for a project of this size. No one wants to pay more taxes, especially when the money is going towards a plan that could be counterproductive. Besides, we just don't have billions of dollars to spend on projects like this.

It's imperative to exhaust all other options before agreeing to a plan of this magnitude. This proposal seems to have more negatives than positives for the community as a whole. I look forward to the introduction of other plans that are introduced in the near future that will not have such negative consequences for the local residents.

(b) (6) Sincerely